BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)))	
ERIC JEROME GRIGSBY, M.D.	Case No.	12-2013-235257
Physician's and Surgeon's))	
Certificate No. G64848		
Respondent)))	

DECISION

The attached Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on <u>August 16, 2017.</u>

IT IS SO ORDERED July 17, 2017.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Rv.

Jamie Wright, J.D., Chair

Panel A

	•	v	
. 1	XAVIER BECERRA		
2	Attorney General of California JANE ZACK SIMON		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General MACHAELA M. MINGARDI		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 194400		
5	455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004		
	Telephone: (415) 703-5696		
6	Facsimile: (415) 703-5480 Attorneys for Complainant		
7		RE THE	
8	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
9	STATE OF C	CALIFORNIA	
10	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 12-2013-235257	
11	ERIC GRIGSBY, M.D.	0450 140. 12 2013 233237	
12		STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND	
13	P.O. Box 5510 Napa, CA 94581	DISCIPLINARY ORDER FOR PUBLIC REPRIMAND	
14	Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No.		
15	G64848		
16	Respondent.		
17	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AG	REED by and between the parties to the above-	
18	entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:		
19	PAF	RTIES	
20	1. Kimberly Kirchmeyer (Complainant) is the Executive Director of the Medical Board		
21	of California (Board). She brought this action solely in her official capacity and is represented in		
22	this matter by Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of the State of California, by Machaela M.		
23	Mingardi, Deputy Attorney General.		
24	2. Respondent Eric Grigsby, M.D. (Respondent) is represented in this proceeding by		
25	attorney Peter Osinoff, Esq., whose address is: 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1750, Los		
26	Angeles, CA 90071-1562.		
27	3. On or about December 27, 1988, the Board issued Physician and Surgeon's		
28	Certificate No. G64848 to Eric Grigsby, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician and Surgeon's		
		1	

Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 12-2013-235257, and will expire on October 31, 2016, unless renewed.

<u>JURISDICTION</u>

- 4. Accusation No. 12-2013-235257 was filed before the Board, and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on May 27, 2015. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation.
- 5. A copy of Accusation No. 12-2013-235257 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 6. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 12-2013-235257. Respondent has also carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.
- 7. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.
- 8. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

- 9. Respondent understands and agrees that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 12-2013-235257, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Physician and Surgeon's Certificate.
- 10. For the purpose of resolving the Accusation without the expense and uncertainty of further proceedings, Respondent agrees that his Physician and Surgeon's Certificate is subject to

//

28

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

A. PUBLIC REPRIMAND

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent Eric Grigsby, M.D., as holder of Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. G64848, shall be and hereby is publicly reprimanded pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2227. This Public Reprimand is issued as a result of the following:

From August 2010 to June 2013, Respondent failed to adequately monitor and respond to urine drug screen results for Patient P.D., and/or failed to adequately document treatment decisions for Patient P.D.

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reprimand and have fully discussed it with my attorney, Peter Osinoff, Esq. I understand the Stipulation and the effect it will have on my Physician and Surgeon's Certificate. I enter into this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reprimand voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California.

DATED: May 4, 2017

ERIC GRIGSBY, M.D.

Respondent

I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Eric Grigsby, M.D. the terms and conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. I approve its form and content.

DATED: May 9, 2017

PETER OSINOFF, Esq. Attorney for Respondent

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Medical Board of California. Dated: 5/10/2017 Respectfully submitted, XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
JANE ZACK SIMON
Supervising Deputy Attorney General MACHAELA M. MINGARDI Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant 9. SF2014410628 41746512.docx

STIPULATED SETTLEMENT (12-2013-235257)

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 12-2013-235257

FILED STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California SACRAMENTO May 27 2 JANE ZACK SIMON Supervising Deputy Attorney General 3 MACHAELA M. MINGARDI Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 194400 4 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 5 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 703-5696 6 Facsimile: (415) 703-5480 Attorneys for Complainant 7 BEFORE THE 8 MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 Case No. 12-2013-235257 In the Matter of the Accusation Against: 11 ERIC GRIGSBY, M.D. 12 ACCUSATION P.O. Box 5510 13 Napa, CA 94581 14 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. 15 G64848 16 Respondent. 17 18 Complainant alleges: **PARTIES** 19 Kimberly Kirchmeyer (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official 20 1. capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer 21 22 Affairs. On or about December 27, 1988, the Medical Board of California issued Physician's 2. 23 and Surgeon's Certificate Number G64848 to Eric Grigsby, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's 24 and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought 25 herein and will expire on October 31, 2016, unless renewed. 26 27 28 1

Accusation

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Medical Board of California (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
- 4. Section 2227 of the Code provides that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his or her license revoked, suspended for a period not to exceed one year, placed on probation and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or such other action taken in relation to discipline as the Board deems proper.
 - 5. Section 2234 of the Code, states:

"The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.
 - "(b) Gross negligence.
- "(c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more negligent acts or omissions. An initial negligent act or omission followed by a separate and distinct departure from the applicable standard of care shall constitute repeated negligent acts.
- "(1) An initial negligent diagnosis followed by an act or omission medically appropriate for that negligent diagnosis of the patient shall constitute a single negligent act.
- "(2) When the standard of care requires a change in the diagnosis, act, or omission that constitutes the negligent act described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the standard of care.
 - "(d) Incompetence.
- "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

"(f) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a certificate.

"(g) The practice of medicine from this state into another state or country without meeting the legal requirements of that state or country for the practice of medicine. Section 2314 shall not apply to this subdivision. This subdivision shall become operative upon the implementation of the proposed registration program described in Section 2052.5.

"(h) The repeated failure by a certificate holder, in the absence of good cause, to attend and participate in an interview by the board. This subdivision shall only apply to a certificate holder who is the subject of an investigation by the board."

Section 2242(a) provides that prescribing, dispensing or furnishing dangerous drugs 6. without an appropriate examination and a medical indication constitutes unprofessional conduct.

7. Section 2266 of the Code states: "The failure of a physician and surgeon to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients constitutes unprofessional conduct."

Section 725 of the Code states: 8.

"(a) Repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing, furnishing, dispensing, or administering of drugs or treatment, repeated acts of clearly excessive use of diagnostic procedures, or repeated acts of clearly excessive use of diagnostic or treatment facilities as determined by the standard of the community of licensees is unprofessional conduct for a physician and surgeon "

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct: Gross Negligence and/or Repeated Negligent Acts and/or Incompetence and/or Excessive Prescribing related to the care of Patient P.D.)

Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 2234, and/or 2234(b), 9. and/or 2234(c), and/or 2234(d) of the Code in that Respondent committed unprofessional conduct amounting to gross negligence and/or repeated negligent acts and/or incompetence in the care and treatment of Patient P.D. Respondent is also subject to disciplinary action under sections 725 and 2242(a) of the Code in that Respondent excessively prescribed to Patient P.D. without a proper medical indication. The circumstances are as follows:

- 10. On or about March 27, 2001, Patient P.D. suffered a Worker's Compensation injury after heavy lifting while working at a hotel. She was 36 years old.
- 11. Patient P.D. first went to Respondent for treatment on October 4, 2001. She reported that she was a former bartender with a history of alcohol abuse, but claimed to be clean for years. Respondent's treatment plan for Patient P.D. included prescriptions for Oxycodone ¹ and Oxycontin, ² which he prescribed to her for many years.
- 12. For example, in 2006, Respondent regularly prescribed Patient P.D. 60 milligrams (mg) of Oxycontin twice a day and 5 mg of Oxycodone 8 times a day.
- 13. On March 13, 2006, Patient P.D. had an orthopedic Agreed Medical Evaluation with another physician, Dr. M.S. He found that there was no structure abnormality in Patient P.D.'s cervical spine. He stated that surgery was not indicated and recommended a regular exercise program. He believed that Patient P.D. was chemically dependent and suggested a major change in the direction of her medical care because of the great gulf between the objective findings and the huge amount of opioids she was taking.
- 14. Respondent continued to maintain Patient P.D. on high doses of opioids. Respondent also treated Patient P.D. with occipital nerve stimulation for her headaches, but she reported little improvement of her condition over time.
- 15. On or about April 4, 2006, Patient P.D.'s sister sent a letter to Respondent via certified mail. The letter is in Patient P.D.'s chart and states that Patient P.D.'s family is greatly concerned for her. More specifically, the letter states the following: Patient P.D.'s family believes that she is abusing her pills and has been for quite some time. She has lied to Respondent's office to get more pills. Patient P.D. has forgotten her children. She has forgotten where she left them. She has forgotten to pick them up from school. She has been found asleep

Oxycodone is a pure agonist opioid whose principal therapeutic action is analgesia. Other therapeutic effects of oxycodone include anxiolysis, euphoria, and feelings of relaxation. Oxycodone is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4022 and a Schedule II controlled substance and narcotic as defined by section 11055(b)(1) of the Health and Safety Code.

Oxycontin is a trade name for oxycodone hydrochloride controlled-release tablets. It is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4022 and a Schedule II controlled substance and narcotic as defined by section 11055(b)(1) of the Health and Safety Code.

. 28

and unable to wake up. She has gotten violent when drinking alcohol with her medication. Other friends have asked the family what is going on with her. They are concerned that Patient P.D.'s children will be taken away from her. They are concerned about her driving and being "under the influence." The letter begs for help and a response from Respondent.

- 16. Respondent, in his interview with the Board, stated that he had never seen this letter. He also stated that he had never seen any written correspondence from Patient P.D.'s family members. However, in a letter dated June 28, 2006 to the State Compensation Insurance Fund, Respondent wrote the following: "I have recently received a letter from the patient's family who has concerns about the patient's mental status and possible over use of medications" He also states that Patient P.D. admitted to him that she used alcohol "on an occasional basis." The letter is signed by Respondent.
- 17. Respondent continued to maintain Patient P.D. on high doses of opioids. For example, on January 11, 2010, she was taking 40 mg of Oxycontin 4 times a day and 15 mg of Oxycodone 6 times a day.
- 18. On or about August 21, 2012, Patient P.D. reported to Respondent that she could only sit, stand or walk for 0-1 minutes. If true, this would be a significant finding and would warrant a change in her treatment plan, including appropriate referrals to specialists. Respondent documented no particularized response to Patient P.D.'s report, which appears inconsistent with other data, such as the fact that she drove herself to Respondent's office and walked with no assisted devices.
- 19. On December 13, 2012, Patient P.D. was hospitalized at Queen of the Valley Hospital for an acutely altered mental state. Her UDS (Urine Drug Screen) were positive for oxycodone and negative for alcohol. She was discharged on December 20, 2012. A letter dated January 3, 2013 written by Respondent indicates that Patient P.D.'s opioids were greatly reduced in the hospital due to Patient P.D.'s altered mental status, which then "quickly cleared."
- 20. Despite this, after Patient P.D. was released from the hospital, Respondent increased her Oxycontin from 10 mg twice a day to 20 mg twice a day, and started Oxycodone again at 5

mg six times a day. By February 19, 2013, she was prescribed 30 mg of Oxycodone up to 5 times a day. The reason for either increase is absent from Patient P.D.'s medical records.

- 21. In May 2013, Patient P.D. was seen again at Queen of the Valley hospital, this time for a fall.
- 22. During Respondent's treatment of Patient P.D., alcohol was found in Patient P.D.'s UDS many times, including samples taken on the following dates since August 1, 2010: August 11, 2010; February 16, 2011; April 9, 2012; July 18, 2012; September 18, 2012; and July 25, 2013. Patient P.D. claimed the positive results were from hand sanitizer, but each of these results is consistent with the use of alcohol and inconsistent with the use of hand sanitizer.
- 23. At some point in 2013, Patient P.D. became homeless and began living out of her car. Respondent admitted during his interview with the Board that he was aware that Patient P.D. had become homeless.
- 24. On December 9, 2013, Patient P.D.'s sister called Respondent's office and stated that Patient P.D. was homeless, living in her car, selling her pain medications and drinking "gallons" of vodka per day.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct: Gross Negligence and/or Repeated Negligent Acts and/or Incompetence and/or Excessive Prescribing related to the care of Patient N.P.)

- 25. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 2234, and/or 2234(b), and/or 2234(c), and/or 2234(d), and/or 2266 of the Code in that Respondent committed unprofessional conduct amounting to gross negligence and/or repeated negligent acts and/or incompetence in the care and treatment of Patient N.P., and/or failed to maintain adequate and accurate records for Patient N.P. Respondent is also subject to disciplinary action under sections 725 and 2242(a) of the Code in that Respondent excessively prescribed to Patient N.P. without a proper medical indication. The circumstances are as follows:
- 26. Patient N.P., a patient on Medicare, was first referred to Respondent more than ten years ago in October of 2004. She had multiple medical problems, including but not limited to

the following: Diabetes mellitus with secondary gastric paresis with abdominal pain; chest wall pain, interstitial cystitis and pelvic pain; fibromyalgia; and intestinal pseudo-obstruction with malabsorption. Patient N.P. was functionally disabled. Multiple specialists have been involved in her care.

- 27. Patient N.P. has been maintained on opioids, often at very high levels. For example, in March of 2012, Respondent prescribed Patient N.P. Actiq³ at 1600 mcg 8 times a day, a fentanyl⁴ patch at 200 mcg per day, and a hydrocodone/APAP⁵ elixir at 60 ml per day. She also was prescribed Carisoprodol⁶, which goes by the trade name Soma, and Temazepam⁷ by her primary care physician (PCP).
- 28. On January 9, 2013, Patient N.P. reported to Respondent that she had altered speech and an altered mental status on Christmas Eve of 2012, and that it took three days for her to return to her normal state.
- 29. On August 7, 2013, Patient N.P. reported to Respondent that her family called her an "addict" and said that she was experiencing periods of amnesia. In response, Respondent requested that her PCP decrease her dosage of Soma from 6 tablets per day to 3 tablets per day. This reduced dosage of Soma, however, is still a sedating dose.

³ Actiq, a trade name for oral transmucosal fentanyl citrate, is a potent opioid analgesic, intended for oral transmucosal administration. It is a Schedule II controlled substance as defined by section 11055 of the Health and Safety code. Actiq is indicated only for the management of breakthrough cancer pain in patients with malignancies who are already receiving and who are tolerant to opioid therapy for their underlying persistent cancer pain.

⁴ Fentanyl is a Schedule II controlled substance as defined by section 11055 of the Health and Safety Code. Fentanyl is a strong opioid medication and is indicated only for treatment of chronic pain that cannot be managed by lesser means. Fentanyl presents a risk of serious or life-threatening hypoventilation. Fentanyl can produce drug dependence similar to that produced by morphine and has the potential for abuse. It is physically and psychologically addictive.

⁵ Hydrocodone/APAP, hydrocodone with acetaminophen, is a Schedule III controlled substance and narcotic as defined by section 11056(e) of the Health and Safety Code. Repeated administration of hydrocodone over a course of several weeks may result in psychic and physical dependence. At high levels, acetaminophen can cause liver and kidney toxicity.

⁶ Carisoprodol, commonly sold under the trade name Soma, is a muscle-relaxant and sedative. It is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4022. Carisoprodol combined with other psychotropic drugs may be addictive and appropriate caution should be exercised in administration to patients with compromised liver or kidney functions.

Temazepam is a hypnotic agent. It is a dangerous drug as defined by section 4022 and a Schedule IV controlled substance and narcotic as defined by Section 11057(d) of the Health and Safety Code. Temazepam is indicated for the short-term treatment of insomnia (generally 7 to 10 days). As with any hypnotic, caution must be exercised in administering temazepam to individuals known to be addiction prone.

- 30. Two days later on August 9, 2013, Patient N.P. called Respondent's office and said she "blacked out" and hit her head on a cabinet.
- 31. Following her August 7, 2013 visit, Patient N.P. was worked up by other specialists, including her neurologist. Testing, such as an electroencephalogram (EEG), did not provide any explanation for the periods of amnesia or for the "black out."
- 32. On September 5, 2013, Patient N.P. reported to Respondent that her mother threw out some of her medications because she felt she was abusing them.
- 33. On October 30, 2013, Patient N.P.'s level of fentanyl was lowered. The note regarding the decrease in the fentanyl dosage merely states "Black outs'- pt. agrees to taper COT (sic) as she believes the Soma keeps her functioning." There is no rationale stated as to why the fentanyl dosage was decreased.
- 34. In summary, Patient N.P. was on high doses of opioids, with a very high morphine equivalent, along with sedating doses of Soma. Respondent made no effort to either lower her opioid dosage to see if that affected her "blacking out" or to understand why her family felt she was abusing her medications. If the fentanyl was lowered in response to these episodes, it came more than two months after the fact and was never documented. In fact, Respondent's documentation for this change was so poor that during his interview with the Board, he incorrectly stated that the change in the fentanyl dosage was an increase to compensate for the stopping of the Actiq, which had been done several months before, rather than a decrease.
- 35. The failure to investigate the roll of Patient N.P.'s opioid usage in her "blacking out" or her family's impression that she was an "addict" abusing her pain medication is a departure from the standard of care. The failure to keep accurate records as described above is an additional departure from the standard of care.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct: Incompetence and/or Failure to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Records related to the care of Patient B.B.)

36. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 2234, and/or 2234(c), and/or 2234(d) and/or 2266 of the Code in that Respondent was incompetent in the care and

treatment of Patient B.B. and/or failed to maintain adequate and accurate records for Patient B.B. The circumstances are as follows:

- 37. Respondent saw 26-year-old Patient B.B., an Iraq war veteran, beginning in February of 2012 regarding complaints of back, shoulder and knee pain. By January 14, 2013, Respondent was prescribing Patient B.B. 8 pills of Hydrocodone/APAP per day. As noted above, Hydrocodone/APAP, also known by the trade name Norco, is a Schedule III controlled substance and narcotic as defined by section 11056(c) of the Health and Safety Code. Repeated administration of hydrocodone over a course of several weeks may result in psychic and physical dependence. The usual adult dosage is one or two tablets every four to six hours as needed for pain. The maximum 24-hour dosage recommended is 6 tablets for chronic pain therapy, and a maximum of 8 to 10 tablets for acute pain (less than two weeks). At high levels, acetaminophen can cause liver and kidney toxicity.
- 38. During a 28-day period in 2013, Respondent prescribed Patient B.B. 480 pills of Norco. Respondent prescribed Patient B.B. 120 tablets of Norco on 1/14/2013, 120 tablets of Norco on 1/20/2013, 120 tablets of Norco on 2/4/2013, and 120 tablets of Norco on 2/11/2013. This is a 60-day supply of opioids. The medical records for Patient B.B. do not explain why this occurred. In fact, the medical records do not even demonstrate an awareness that an overprescription of opioids took place.
- 39. The standard of care requires that the rationale for why opioids are being prescribed be documented. If there are early refills, the rationale for those refills should be provided. In this case, there is no record in Patient B.B.'s medical chart that the 2/4/2013 or 2/11/2013 prescriptions were ever written. There is no explanation as to why the additional prescriptions were necessary. The failure to document why Respondent over-prescribed opioids during this time period is a departure from the standard of care.
- 40. In addition, three Urine Drug Screens taken from May 2012 to September 2012 for Patient B.B. tested positive for alcohol. Despite these three screens showing alcohol use, there is no discussion regarding this alcohol use in Patient B.B.'s chart. As noted above, Patient B.B. was on daily opiates. Also as noted above, in his interview with the Board, the Respondent noted that